

LONDONIYYAH 25

# THE TRAGICOMEDY OF MOHAMMED HIJĀB





Verily all praise is due to Allah who is One with no partner, and may His ṣalawāt and salām be upon the one sent with the sword and religion of truth to make it prevail over all. To follow,

This is a refutation of one the Surūrī allies of Shayṭān, Muḥammed Ḥijāb one of the dajājilah of this time and a distorter of the pure religion of Allāh, a utilitarian whose only metric to truth is how much maṣlahah one can obtain through it, and whether the majority of the general Muslim (and kāfir) population is on board with it. On April 12<sup>th</sup>, 2022, a lecture of his, from a series of lectures on a poem Londoniyyah, was released on the YouTube channel titled Sapience Institute. This is the 25<sup>th</sup> lecture of his Londoniyyah series and its title claims it deals with the matter of takfīr, but in reality it deals with lying upon the sincere, truthful muwahhidūn, ridiculing them, mixing truth with falsehood (but most of it is falsehood), and speaking on matters of which this ultracrepidarian has little to no knowledge – which appears to be a habit of his. We will comment on eighteen portions of the lecture which we deem important to address, and where appropriate, references to this man's other work will be addressed as well. Majority of Ḥijāb's sheananigans include his loyal lapdog Ali Democracy who is better known by the nickname the Jāmī group gave him – Ali Needs Dawah – a fitting label, despite coming from a group of liars. However, this is not the place to address him, as that zindiq has produced so many blunders of his own, he's deserving of a separate publication all for himself.

An address to the muwahhidūn wherever they may be, the time of Jāmīyyah has come to an end – they are quickly becoming defunded (no thanks to the gang being addressed here) and their last bastion appears to be in the UK. Today new deviant groups have risen to prominence - Surūrīyyah being the most vicious of them, their western groups emulating the same tactics the Jāmīyyah made use of in the last century to dominate the da'wah scene, and coming with an even more distorted version of Islām. Rather, it is no longer Islām with the foundation being the kalimah of tawhid even if the mushrikūn hate it – no, its kalimah is to maximize all maṣlahah and to minimize all mafṣadah, even if the muwahhidūn hate it. May Allah guide us away from their zandaqah and protect us from desiring their victory, and rid us of their heads and grant the truthful ones tamkīn in the lands. Āmīn.

## 1. What he said between 00:00:15 and 00:00:45

*And this is a session which is about takfir. And takfir really is the Arabic word - meaning, to excommunicate – in the terminological sense. And why have we decided to talk about this? Because it's something which affects the Muslim community and affects the da'wah of Muslims, it affects cohesion within Islām or within the Muslim world, people in Islām. And therefore it's worthy of discussion. It's worthy of elaboration, it's worthy of elucidation.*

### 1.1 His faulty definition of takfir

The correct terminological definition of takfir is to rule upon a belief, saying, or action with kufr, or to rule upon an individual with kufr once the conditions have been met and impediments have been lifted. It does not mean to excommunicate, as that carries a meaning which greatly differs from this definition in both Christianity and Judaism, and its use has never been adopted by Muslims for that reason.

### 1.2 Those he paints to be the victims of takfir

He further mentions that takfir affects X and Y, mostly negatively, so he mentions the Muslim community, which really means his group and whoever agrees with them, as the greater Muslim ummah would never accept the points he has made throughout this lecture. It also, according to him, affects the da'wah of Muslims. This means that declaring takfir upon zanādiqah such as himself has a negative effect on his organisations whose purpose is to spread this zandaqah under the cloak of da'wah. The final group which takfir affects, is the cohesion of the people in Islām. Notice he did not say people of Islām. That is because this zindīq would have you believe that Rāfiḍah and other murtaddīn are Muslims, even if they fall into evident nullifiers – the knowledge of which he and his gang are trying to lift from the Muslims, for obvious reasons.

## 1. What he said between 00:01:09 and 00:01:41

*So this is a very um, very short and brief uh, poetic expression here and uh, basically what the Shaykh was mentioning here are two groups of people which we're going to handle in turn. The first are referred to as takfīrīs or those who have uh, an inappropriate way of excommunicating other Muslims. And others who are tabdī'īs, who they do the same thing, but when it comes to the bid'ah - or claiming that these people are heretics – of other Muslims. They're taking them out of the fold of orthodoxy.*

## 2.1 About those whom he refers to as takfiris

A newcomer into the world of Mohammed Ḥijāb would think that who is being referred to here is somebody who declares takfir upon Muslims based on his desires and assumptions, which is, however, not what Ḥijāb is intending. Those who are referred to in this quote are whoever declares takfir upon individuals or actions which go against the desires of Ḥijāb and his Surūrī gang. Once we progress further, it will become evidently clear that this is truly what Ḥijāb intends by the term takfīrī, and that he's using it to describe individuals who he deems dangerous, despite often fitting his own definition himself.

## 2.2 About those whom he refers to as tabdi'īs

Here nobody will doubt that Ḥijāb refers to the Jāmī gang, however, his criticism of them is based on faulty grounds – as Ḥijāb does not believe in tabdī'ī at all – that is unless, similar with takfir, he can use it himself as a bully tactic. So he will declare tabdī'ī<sup>1</sup> and even takfir<sup>2</sup> upon his opponents, like he did with the Jāmīyyah, not based on any uṣūl but his own desires, declaring them as disbelievers on grounds which he himself deems invalid.

### What he said between 00:01:44 and 00:03:09

*Now, takfīrism is a very important topic – not least because it is the gate way, if you like, it is the auxiliary to these kinds of groups which kill people whether Muslims or non-Muslims in trains, planes and automobiles. They are the ones who, ISIS as we've seen for example, kill other Muslims and other individuals, we've seen them try and take land in the Middle east and do all kinds of atrocious acts and they take us back, they take us back in terms of the da'wah, they take us back in terms of what we stand for, they take us back in terms of what Muslims come to represent and of course, they act as a serious barrier to entry for Muslims that are considering, or people that are considering Islām as a religion of truth, because they say look at this, this is a religion of war it's a religion of violence, it's a religion of barbarism and so on and so forth. So we need to know where this all starts (...) because if we are not (familiar), then once again the detractors (...) those individuals who have been tainted and corrupted with these kinds of ideologies, will make it seem as if this is the interpretation which is normative and orthodox within Islām.*

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=borEtDYcy0k>

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=APCku7NkidA>

### 3.1 He deems takfir as the gateway to join those he deems his enemies

Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله said: Takfir is hukm shar'i which renders someone's wealth permissible to take, his blood permissible to spill, and that he's sentenced with abiding in the hellfire. Thus it is taken how the rest of the shar'i rulings are taken.<sup>3</sup>

There is no doubt in the mind of any Muslim that takfir is an essential part of their religion, applied where Allah and His Messenger ﷺ applied it, just like praying is obligatory where Allah and His Messenger ﷺ made prayer obligatory.

### 3.2 He claims those whom he refers to as takfiris act as a barrier to entry to Islām

How is this possible, when – even if he personally disagrees with the approach of such-and-such a group – all evidences for this religion are clear, obvious and elaborate, one can compare these evidences to the actions of all groups – just or unjust – and see for themselves whether they are acting in accordance with the religion of Allah or not. That is, after all, how we know that Hijāb is a zindiq, sliding kufr into the religion of Islām, and it is how we know that those who fight the occupier to liberate lands and men, are upon the truth – because their actions match the scriptures. So how can one be a barrier to entry of a kāfir into Islām, how can one silence the kāfir when he's about to pronounce the kalimah of tawhīd, when one finds himself under enemy fire in a trench in Shām, or dwelling inside a cave in Khorāsān, or facing crusader bombs in Anbār?! How can such a one prevent a kāfir from becoming guided when none can guide whom Allah has misguided and none can misguide whom Allah has guided?! The simple answer is that Hijāb is not calling to Islām but to himself, thus he is complaining that the kāfir does not accept him, his own group and his own manhaj. Would it be that he calls towards tawhīd in its totality, does not pick-and-choose principles of the religion which ones he decides to affirm that day, and does not constantly change his arguments depending on whom he's debating with, this problem would not have befallen him. That is because the muwahhid knows the kāfir hates him, and will never love him until he can turn him away from his religion.<sup>4</sup> This is clear to anyone who interacts with the Book of Allah and the Sunnah of His Messenger ﷺ. Further, the Muslim understands that cozying-up to the mushrikūn will only bring the wrath of Allah and His

<sup>3</sup> Bughyah al-Murtadd (p. 345) translated by Ahlut Tawhīd Publications

<sup>4</sup> Qur'ān 2:217

punishment, as that is not the way of the believers. From day one, the Messenger ﷺ was calling the mushrikūn to tawḥīd, away from shirk, insulting their gods and belittling their traditions. Anyone who looks into his life will see this.

### **3.3 His claim that those who have been "corrupted" by the takfirī ideology make it seem as if that is the normative and orthodox interpretation of Islām**

That is because the evidences for takfir are many in the religion, from the Qur'ān, Sunnah and Ijmā' and from the actions of the sahābah, the tābi'īn, and those who followed them. Just because somebody errs in their takfir does not make the practice obsolete, as a mujtahid who errs will get one reward. And because somebody misuses takfir, then there are also groups and individuals who misuse da'wah and run it like a business – and many of their names are well-known.

#### **4. What he said between 00:03:30 and 00:04:44**

*As we'll come to find out that excommunication is needed for the killing of people in order to categorize them as ḥarbis. Which is really a category, which is the combatant. And the jurists in Islām have divided, you know, non-Muslims - for convenience - into three different groups. The mu'ahid, the dhimmi, and the ḥarbī. The combatant one, meaning the one who means harm to you and to your community, the one who is a threat. And so obviously, in order to attack and kill Muslims, you'd have to first get them out of Islām, and then make the argument that they are now in this category of ḥarbī or the combatant category. So there's two things that need to be done. First the excommunication needs to be done, and then to need to somehow argue that they are not just disbelievers, because an apostate would not be killed through vigilantism, okay that you need to argue that these people are actually combatants, they are um, somehow a threat to you – an existential threat to you and to your community and that their blood is halāl, literally these are the steps that need to be taken.*

#### **4.1 His claim that it is necessary rule upon an individual with apostasy to categorize him as a kāfir ḥarbī**

This is simply not the case. The asl with regards to the lands of mushrikūn is that they are diyār al-ḥarb – that is abodes of war – and need a covenant with the Islāmic State in order for their wealth and blood to become protected. This

is a well-known principle among the Muslims and their scholars, and one does not need to judge upon an individual with apostasy in order to bypass a non-existent obstacle. The apostate is one who returns to kufr after Islām. The one who was originally upon kufr is not an apostate, and that does not change the hukm of permissibility upon his wealth and blood, despite of what this zindīq would have you believe.

#### **4.2 The kāfir ḥarbī is any kāfir without a valid covenant – not just the combatants who wish harm upon the Muslim community**

Shaykh Nāṣir al-Fahd فَكَ اللَّهُ أَسْرِه said: Because the disbeliever generally is upon one of two categories. The first is the muḥārib kāfir, and this is the asl regarding the kāfir, as the scholars of Islām have formed consensus upon it being fard upon the Ummah, during its condition of strength, to wage war against the disbelievers in their own countries, and they merely disagreed about how often (this should be done) from that... – until he said: And the second is the dhimmī kāfir, and the scholars of Islām have consensus upon him being (forced to pay) the Jizyah and humiliation and the rulings of the people of dhimmah are placed upon him.<sup>5</sup>

#### **4.3 The blood and wealth of the apostate is ḥalāl if he resides in dār al-ḥarb regardless of whether he is an existential threat to the Muslims, and vigilantism plays no role in this**

Ibn Qudāmah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ said: There are three sayings from ash-Shāfi‘ī, and from them, the one according to us is that it [apostasy] is a cause by which his blood becomes permissible, however his ownership [of property] is not lifted from him, like the zinā of a muḥṣan. His sentence is killing, however the sanctity of his property is not lifted from him just like the zānī muḥṣan and a killer in a rebellion. As for the people of war, the sanctity of their property is tied to their own sanctity, so if the apostate resides in dār al-ḥarb, his ownership is not lifted, however it is permissible to kill him – for anyone – without to request his repentance, and to take his wealth, for whoever overpowers him, because he has became a ḥarbī, and his hukm is the hukm of the people of war. Similarly, if a group apostated and resisted obedience to the Imām of the Muslims in their land, the sanctity of their lives and wealth is lifted from them, because the

---

<sup>5</sup> At-Tankīl Bi Mā Fī Bayān al-Muthaqqafīn Min al-Abātil (1/139) translated by at-Tibyān publications

original disbelievers have no sanctity in their own land, and the apostates are first [Meaning, worse in kufr than the original kāfir].<sup>6</sup>

### 5. What he said between 00:04:56 and 00:05:12

*It's not true by the way, to think that all takfīris are salafī-inclined as we're going to come to see today. Many takfīris are ṣūfī-inclined, they are ash'arī-inclined and have been ash'arī-inclined, māturīdī – all of the groups of Islām there have been takfīris in every single one of them.*

That is because takfīr is a normative practice as evidenced by the muḥkam of revelation and consensus of the Muslims.

Even your liberal modernist brothers who do not pray, do not keep the jamā'ah, do not ally based on Islām and disassociate based on it, and use Islām as a political tool if anything else, declare takfīr upon groups and individuals, although often their takfīr is way off – like when many of them declare takfīr upon the mujāhidūn for killing.

### 6. What he said between 00:05:33 and 00:06:02

*They wouldn't refer like, for example ISIS or al-Qā'idah or Jabhat an-Nuṣrah or whoever may be – they wouldn't refer to you know...ash-Shāfi'i or...or they might actually to be fair, but they wouldn't refer to uh, Abul-Hassan al-Ash'arī for example necessarily, or al-Ghazālī you know, or they wouldn't refer to uh, [al-Fakhr] ar-Rāzī for instance. They would refer to Ibn Taymiyyah, they would refer to 'Abdul-Wahhāb and so on, that is their reading list.*

#### 6.1 Takfīris would not refer to al-Ash'arī, al-Ghazālī, or ar-Rāzī

We are confused – is this a condemnation or praise? Those whom you refer to as takfīris have been known throughout the years for their pure 'aqīdah and manhaj in accordance with the Qur'ān, Sunnah and consensus of the scholars of Islām – it is their selling point. It would not be proper to refer to mubtadi'ah in these matters. However, in the general sciences of Islām, they have been referring to the books of mubtadi'ah and benefitting from their service to Islām – not in manhaj and 'aqīdah however.

---

<sup>6</sup> Al-Mughnī (12/273)

To refer to people of bida' in all matters is apparently the only way to be a proper Muslim, it is the manhaj of the salaf and the way of the believers – according to this clown.

## 6.2 His claim that takfirīs only refer to Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn 'Abdil-Wahhāb

And al-Ājurri, Ahmād, Mālik, ash-Shāfi'i, al-Khuza'i, al-Mizzī, at-Ṭabarī, ash-Shawkānī, aṣ-Ṣan'ānī, Ibn 'Abdil-Barr, et cetera. رحمهم الله Our reading list is quite long, Hijāb might remember it from his time working on his Islāmic Studies degree at SOAS.<sup>7</sup> To marginalize the references of your opponents to a few names is a great injustice, but we do not expect anything else from this Surūrī zindīq.

### 7. What he said between 00:06:28 and 00:06:53

*And by the way there's ayah in the Qur'ān (...) that do not say to the one who uh, who says salām that you're not is it-is it mu'min? That you're not a mu'minah that you're not a believer, that you may try and you know get some kind of worldly gain from that.*

## 7.1 The muwaḥhidūn do not declare takfīr upon those who are apparently Muslims

The manhaj of the muwaḥhidūn in takfīr is that we do not declare takfīr upon any mukallaf [i.e. one who is sane, mature, and not under compulsion] from among the people of the Qiblah unless they commit something which nullifies aṣl ad-dīn [the foundation of the religion] of beliefs, sayings and actions, or deny something which is known from Islām by necessity – unless they live far away from the Muslims and do not have access to this knowledge.

## 7.2 The muwaḥhidūn have no motivation to declare takfīr upon a Muslim for any worldly gain

Because there is simply nothing to gain from it – only the wrath of Allāh. Would somebody declare a Muslim to be a kāfir out of desires, that is a major sin at minimum, reaching the level of kufr if it was out of enmity towards his upholding the religion of Allāh. Other than that, there is nothing to get from declaring takfīr generally let alone to declare takfīr upon Muslims unjustly – the takfīrī is treated as the worst of mankind these days – in part thanks to Hijāb.

<sup>7</sup> Read: The Spy Academy

Shaykh Nāṣir al-Fahd فَكَ اللَّهُ أَسْرَه said: Whoever said it (i.e. declared a Muslim a kāfir) due to injustice, enmity from opposition and accusation while he is truly a muwahhid inwardly, then this person is in danger. However, it does not appear to mean – and Allah جَلَ وَعَلَى knows best, that his kufr is major kufr. Rather he could have fallen into an enormous sin and minor kufr. This is what the vast majority of scholars are upon. Third case: Whoever made takfir upon him without a misinterpretation or misconception, so here he becomes a kāfir since he made īmān equal as kufr, and based on this al-Bukhārī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ wrote a chapter-heading: "Whoever Makes Takfir Upon His Brother Without Ta'wīl, Then He Is Like What He Said." End quote. Likewise, he mentioned some textual evidences regarding this such as: "Whoever says to his brother O Kāfir..." until the end of the ḥadīth. Pay attention: The difference between the first case and the second case is that the first case is a ta'wīl based upon a valid (shar') misinterpretation by using evidences from the texts (Qur'ān and Sunnah). Along with the purpose of establishing the truth for the sake of Allah سبحانه وتعالى while ordaining the good and forbidding the evil. But as for the second case, then his ta'wīl is not a valid misinterpretation. Even if he used evidences from the Sharī'ah, with the purpose of enmity against his opponent, oppression and gaining victory for himself. And Allah جَلَ وَعَلَى knows best.<sup>8</sup>

## 8. What he said between 00:07:08 and 00:07:50

*Now the truth of the matter is that sometimes there needs to be takfir as well, we're not saying, the argument is not that there's no such thing as takfir in Islām. I mean I don't want anyone to get that wrong because there are some things which if you do reject, that you become a disbeliever. For example if someone rejects the prophethood of prophet Muhammad ﷺ or the oneness of God or the things which are known by necessity in the religion of Islām. They cannot- even if they call themselves Muslim, they cannot actually be Muslim. Because being Muslim is not just believing in Allah and His Messenger. It's actually believing in Allah and His Messenger in the ways which are clear in the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.*

### 8.1 Kufr is in rejecting evidences

Shaykh Nāṣir al-Fahd فَكَ اللَّهُ أَسْرَه said while explaining the principles behind chain takfir: Know, firstly, that the origin regarding this principle is not related to circumstances involving doing or saying what is disbelief, rather it is related

<sup>8</sup> Al-Fatāwā al-Ḥāfiyyah (p. 75-78) translated by Ahlut Tawhīd Publications

to rejecting reports [i.e. āyāt, ahadīth, etc] and accepting them, so whoever leaves the disbeliever without doing takfir of him, this would be considered a denial on his behalf of the reports that involve doing takfir of him, and upon this, there is no doubt that the report regarding takfir of him must be authentic and agreed upon, and there is no doubt that the one who leaves-off doing takfir must be rejecting these reports. For the mukaffirāt [those things that make one a disbeliever], are not one, and falling into them also is not upon one level...refer to the full work.<sup>9</sup>

### **8.2 The one who rejects something which is known from Islām by necessity disbelieves**

However, it appears that those who Ḥijāb refers to as takfīrīs, are more lenient than him. As they do give the excuse of ignorance to those truly ignorant, meaning those who have just entered Islām, or who have been brought up far away from the Muslims, as opposed to those who have access to knowledge and scholars to teach them these matters.

### **8.3 Tahākum to the Tāghūt renders the Islām of the mukallaf null and void**

Contrary to what Ḥijāb would have you believe, tawḥīd in legislation – desiring it, imposing it, and making tahākum to it – is from the foundation of the religion, from the clear matters which are known through the intellect and fitrah and evidenced by clear-cut muhkam āyāt in the Qur'ān<sup>10</sup> – anyone who is pleased with a legislation of shirk and tandīd, or supports it against the shar' of Allah, becomes mushrik kāfir.

Muftī Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm رحمة الله said: Contrary to what the supporters of the man-made laws claim - that the people have need of them [indeed that they cannot do without them] and this is to have mistrust in what the Messenger came with and to treat the explanation of Allah and His Messenger as if it is incomplete - and judging it to be insufficient for the people when they disagree - and this will bring an evil result for them in this world and the Hereafter. Consider the generalisation in the second āyah<sup>11</sup> regarding that which is disputed amongst them (...) and Allaah ta'ala has negated the imān of the

<sup>9</sup> <https://adviceforparadise.com/articles/2002/07/20/principle-whoever-does-not-make-takfeer-kafir-kafir/>

<sup>10</sup> Qur'ān 12:40

<sup>11</sup> Qur'ān 4:65

hypocrites who wish to refer for judgement to other than that which the Messenger of Allah came with...<sup>12</sup>

#### **8.4 Democracy is major shirk and one disbelieves if he participates in it while knowing its reality**

Because democracy is a religion for the people, of the people, and by the people, in which ṭawāghīt are voted in power in order to rival Allah by fabricating laws, and the only thing which saves the lay-Muslim is that he is not aware of this reality, due to democracy being from masā'il khafiyyah [obscure matters] one does not disbelieve until the reality of this wicked religion has been made apparent to him, and all Muslims are in consensus that legislation is for none but Allah.

Shaykh Hasān ibn Huṣayn aş-Şūmālī حفظه الله said – in summary: The people of our era differed concerning the process of democratic elections with various opinions, and there is no need to mention them all now. That which I see correct, is that it is a kufrī ṭāghūtī process where whoever participates in it or is pleased with it or calls to it or encourages it or praises it, disbelieves in a general sense; however, I elaborate when it comes to the sense of applying the rulings upon individuals and groups...Refer to the full work for his evidences.<sup>13</sup>

#### **9. What he said between 00:09:09 and 00:10:20**

*And funny enough Ibn Hajar al-Haytami who once again would not be accepted by the likes of ISIS and so on. He believes in istighāthah (...) and in the newer time which is interesting, they have [something] which is called Nawāqid al-Islām, which is written by Muhammad bin Abdulwahhāb which is a book which is a like two-page book, which shouldn't be called really a book, a pamphlet he wrote, but what is novel about the pamphlet that 'Abdulwahhāb wrote was that you don't find that that many books (...) telling you what are the things which if you go against, you will become a disbeliever. This was relegated to the kutub of fiqh and in particular bāb ar-riddah or the chapter of apostasy.*

#### **9.1 His claim that the takfīris do not appreciate the beneficial works of mubtadi'ah**

It has been proven previously that the so-called takfīris do not shy away from the books of the mubtadi'ah or some who have erred in some ta'wīlāt as long as

<sup>12</sup> Tāḥkīm al-Qawānīn

<sup>13</sup> <https://peopleoftawhid.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/A-Question-on-Democratic-Elections.pdf>

those books do not propagate their bida' – and many of the so-called takfīrī scholars often quote the scholars of the past such as Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī, an-Nawawī, as-Subkī, Ibn Ḥazm, az-Zamakhsharī, ibn al-'Arabī, and others.

Shaykh 'Abdur-Rahmān ibn Ḥassan Āl ash-Shaykh رحمه الله said: And as for Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytamī then he is from the later scholars of the Shāfi'iyyah and his 'aqidah is that of the Ashā'irah who negate the attributes [of Allah] so in his speech is some truth and some falsehood.<sup>14</sup>

And Shaykh 'Abdullah ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhāb رحمه الله said: And we also do not speak about kufr of those who are sound upon religion, whose righteousness, knowledge, piety and asceticism is well-known, whose conduct was good and who have delivered naṣīḥah to the ummah by sacrificing themselves in order to teach the beneficial sciences and author [works] in them, even if they erred in this matter or another, like Ibn Ḥajar al-Haytami, because we know of what he wrote in ad-Dur al-Munadhdham, and we do not reject the signs of his knowledge – and that is why we take from his books, such as his Sharḥ al-Arba'īn, and az-Zawājir and other than them, and rely on his transmission because he is from the generality of scholars of the Muslims. This is what we are upon.<sup>15</sup>

So how can you fabricate a lie like this upon the muwahhidūn when their own books prove you wrong?! Or are you hoping your blind-followers will not research for themselves?!

## 9.2 His claim that the books of 'aqīdah never used to include masā'il from the chapters of fiqh

And this is a pure lie, as scholars such as at-Tahāwī رحمه الله included matters of fiqh in their books and booklets [e.g. the permissibility of wiping over the socks or the ḥukm of jihād in the matn of Tahāwīyyah] and likewise the 'aqīdah of Rāziyayn رحهم الله includes the matters of jihād, ḥajj, obedience to the wulāt, and matters of manhaj such as the command to unity and the prohibition of disunity. Further, this matn declares takfīr and tabdi' upon several groups, and sets the condition for teaching the one who says he does not know whether the Qur'ān is created or uncreated, and does not declare takfīr upon such an individual. And such examples are numerous in books of 'aqīdah.

<sup>14</sup> Ad-Durar as-Sannīyyah (3/225)

<sup>15</sup> Ad-Durar as-Sannīyyah (1/236)

## 10. What he said between 00:11:14 and 00:13:02

*Now in terms of the group that we should be aware of, are the khawārij (...) Okay so this is an important point – there is no books that are written by khawārij (...) now the truth of the matter is, jahmism - proto-mu'tazilism there's a lot of works on it, like not proto-mu'tazilism, Wāṣil ibn 'Aṭā' and these guys, and also khawārijism, if you want to call it that right, or khārijism. These things we don't have anything (...) these groups we hear a lot about them. You see in the books of Ḥanābilah, books of Ash'arīs books of Māturīdīs that these groups existed and they're bad, and this is the reason why they're deviant. And we're not saying that's not true, but we're just saying we don't have these guys' books themselves, we don't know to what extent this is a biased, like from a completely strictly academic perspective we don't know to what extent this bias has impacted or distorted the ways in which these people have have understood their version of the truth.*

### 10.1 His claim that khawārij have no books of their own

And this is easily refuted by the reader searching up the books of the Ibādīyyah – the actual khawārij in our era, who have descended from their forefathers the Ḥarūrīyyah and took up some additional bida' along the way.

### 10.2 His distrust of the traditional scholarship

This orientalist-influenced coconut has now decided to doubt all the āthār mentioning all the various bida' of individuals like Jahm لعنہ اللہ and the classical khawārij – does he distrust the ṣahābah, when to affirm their 'adālah is a creedal point among the people of Sunnah?! Or does he deny the authentic chains through which this information has been transmitted to us, or does he doubt the trustworthiness of the scholars such as Ḥarb al-Kirmānī or al-Barbahārī, or al-Bukhārī whose trustworthiness was testified to by the Muslims collectively?!

Shaykh 'Alī al-Khuḍayr فَكَ اللَّهُ أَسْرَه said: Is the one who has been widely praised by the Ummah testified as being in Jannah? This has a difference of opinion, and what's most correct is that whoever has been widely praised, if the 'Ulamā' who have experience and knowledge, and those whose statements are taken into consideration, and that became widespread, then he is testified [with Jannah] due to the Hadīth of when the Janāzah passed by, and they testified it with good, they said: “it must (enter Jannah)”. Such as 'Umar Ibn 'Adil-'Azīz, for he has been widely praised, likewise al-Hassan al-Baṣrī, Mālik, Ahmad, etc... These

[Imāms] have widely been praised, and from the people of consideration, however back to the original question about Ahlal Fatarāt, as for calling them Muslims, then yes, whoever was upon the Foundations of Islām [i.e. Aṣl al-Islām] and didn't commit Shirk [is a Muslim], and as for testifying them with Jannah, then this goes back to what we have just elaborated on.<sup>16</sup>

## 11.What he said between 00:15:15 and 00:20:55

*The khawārij believe that if you commit major sins, that you become a disbeliever. This is the belief of the khawārij (...) but then someone like adh-Dhahabī wrote Kitāb al-Kabā'ir or the book of major sins. He enumerates seventy major sins, so there's some degree of difference here as to what are the major sins of Islām in the first place (...) but they say if you commit a major sin, and then you have become a disbeliever. Which is why they have made takfīr on the ṣahābah themselves - the companions. Now can you imagine that these early people made takfīr they excommunicated the top sahābah – 'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb, Abū Bakr Siddīq, 'Uthmān ibn al-'Affān, they I mean they killed him, they killed that man 'Uthmān ibn al-'Affān was killed by the khawārij alright just think about that for a second right. And the reason why they killed them was because they say they were not ruling by what Allah has revealed (...) whoever does not rule by whatever Allah revealed is a disbeliever (...) they were excommunicating people, they were taking upon themselves to kill people because they were- remember we said it just takes two or three steps – excommunicate them and deem them as combatants and a contrary to Islām and that's it, then you have fighting. You see how quickly it is. Going from a Muslim that you're praying with to someone that you're fighting. Two or three steps it's only two or three steps. Number one excommunicate them, number two claim that they are going against the divine commandments and that they are not ruling by what Allah has revealed, and therefore they are combatants therefore you fight them, you have to fight them. This was the argument (...) almost a blueprint of it is what is being used today by the likes of ISIS (...) and people actually fall for these arguments (...) converts to Islām and they are brainwashed by a political agenda, that's true as well but there's also an ideological element as well this is an ideological element (...) despite the prophet's teachings despite the companions' teachings, not because of them.*

---

<sup>16</sup> <https://ia802801.us.archive.org/12/items/Alial-Khudayr/Sharh%20Kitab%20al-Haqiq%27iq%20Fi-Tawid%20-Shaykh%20%27Ali%20al-Khudayr.pdf>

## 11.1 Regarding what he said about Imām adh-Dhahabī and his book of major sins

Hijāb claims that Dhahabī mentioned some seventy major sins in his book, thus this proves that the takfirīs are somehow wrong? How does that work exactly. Anyway, he clearly has not read Dhahabī's book, or is deliberately trying to deceive his audience. In al-Kabā'ir, such sins are mentioned as major shirk, abandoning ṣalāh] on which the author provides evidences of it being major kufr], resisting zakāt [major kufr by consensus of the ṣahābah], magic and other sins which are mukaffirāt – some agreed-upon and some differed-upon. The point is that claim by Hijāb is refuted by simply looking at the table of contents of that book, one need not even read it.

## 11.2 His lies regarding the beliefs of khawārij

The lie that all khawārij make takfir upon major sinners is proven wrong by the book of al-Baghdādī al-Farq baynal-Firaq where the various groups of khawārij are discussed – those of them who have become apostates and those who have been judged upon with bid'ah. It becomes abundantly clear that the khawārij did not all agree on this point, just like they disagreed on other points – hence their fracture into various groups.

Further, he claims that the khawārij have declared takfir upon Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهم which he needs to bring forth evidence. Until then, we treat him as the liar that he is.

A further lie in this portion of his lecture is his claim that the khawārij were accusing the ṣahābah of not judging by what Allah revealed in the same way that this charge is brought forth today against the ṭawāghīt of the world in general and the apostate regimes in particular. The khawārij applied this āyah on the participants in the Battle of Jamal and the participants of the taḥkīm. Neither of the two was a case of not judging by what Allah revealed, rather the former was a dispute among Muslims which is a sin at most, and the latter was a taḥkīm to the Book of Allah as Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنهم argued – which actually Hijāb mentions in his lecture himself, striking an own goal.

A further misunderstanding this ultracrepidarian has, is that one who declares takfir upon an individual, has to charge him with not judging by what Allah revealed to justify taking his wealth and spilling his blood. What permits the

taking of wealth and spilling blood has been addressed prior so time and energy will not be wasted here.

### **11.3 His claim that the Islāmic State is taking the khawārij as a blueprint**

And he bases this on mistakenly forcing the actions of the khawārij in their own time upon the Islāmic State which acts in its own time and its own reality. Whether you agree with the Islāmic State or not, their takfīr upon the apostate regimes is correct and so is their takfīr upon those who commit tawallī to the disbelievers against them – as having tawallī with the kāfir against a Muslim is riddah for every mukallaf with no tafsīl in it.

Shaykh Dr. 'Abdul-'Azīz Āl 'Abdil-Laṭīf said: Thus assisting the kuffar against the people of Islām is apostasy and departure from Islām. And what is meant by “assisting” is that they support, help manifest, and aid the kuffar against the Muslims. (...) The leading scholars of the Salafi da'wah in the Arabian Peninsula mentioned this calamity, starting with Shaykh Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhāb رحمه الله (...). The scholars of the Salafi da'wah were not limited to just theorizing this issue; they applied this legal ruling on what is appropriate from the realities, with complete firmness and investigation. The one who looks at the two treatises, ad-Dalā'il by Shaykh Sulayman ibn 'Abdillah ibn Muhammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhāb, and An-Najāh waal-Fakāk min Muwalāh al-Murtaddīn wa Ahl al-Ishrāk by Ḥamad ibn 'Atīq, and the occasion of their authorship, surely realizes the seriousness of these knowledgeable scholars regarding this issue and the application of Allah's judgment on those who are caught in this apostasy. Likewise, scholars from the Mālikīyyah ruled that whoever carries arms alongside the kāfir enemy against the Muslims and fights them, his ruling will be the same as the ruling of the kafir concerning his life and property. (see al-Fatāwā al-Fiqhīyyah fi Ahimm al-Qadāya li-Hasan al-Yubī, pp. 229-234)<sup>17</sup>

### **11.4 His ridicule of converts to Islām**

Much like his forefathers 'Abdullah ibn Salūl and his gang of munāfiqūn, Ḥijāb and his gang also ridicule newcomers to Islām from the Anṣār, describing them with weakness, foolishness, mocking them behind their backs and to their faces, he proclaims them his brothers in Islām, and swears to Allah that they are upon the same millah.

---

<sup>17</sup> <https://peopleoftawhid.org/whoever-allies-with-them-from-among-you-is-from-them/>

Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله said: May Allah curse [the hypocrites]<sup>18</sup> Abul-'Āliyyah and as-Suddī said in his tafsīr with a chain from Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn Mas'ūd and others from the ṣahābah, and this was also said by ar-Rabī' ibn Anas and 'Abdur-Rahmān ibn Zayd ibn Aslam and other than them that they used to say: Should us and those be on the same level and tread the same path when they are fools!<sup>19</sup>

He رحمه الله also said: The fool is the ignorant one with a simple mind, not understanding what constitutes benefit and harm.<sup>20</sup>

### 11.5 His claim that **takfir** exists in the religion despite the teaching of the Prophet and his companions and not because of them

Shaykh Muḥammad ibn 'Abdil-Wahhāb رحمه الله said: The reality of this apostasy is that the Arabs have took different paths in it, so a group returned to the worship of idols and said: [Muhammad] was a prophet but he has died. Another group said: We believe in Allah but do not pray. A group affirmed Islām and prayed, but resisted paying zakāt. And a group testified that there is no deity except Allah and that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah, but believed that the prophet ﷺ shared his prophethood with Musaylimah لعنه الله<sup>21</sup>.

Tell us, Hijāb – did the ṣahābah see these as apostates who have turned away from Islām and rejected what was revealed to Muḥammad ﷺ or have they abstained from takfir?! Have they been fighting Muslims then?! Is the one who resists zakāt a Muslim?! Is the one who resist ṣalāh a Muslim?! Is the one who worships idols a Muslim?! Is the one who testifies to the prophethood of small dajājilah a Muslim?! And what did the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say about the one who believes a magician, or the one who affirms the 'aqidah of the qadarīyyah?! Did he say about them that they are Muslims, or did he say that they have disbelieved and that they are the majūs of this nation?! And what did Allah say about those munāfiqūn<sup>22</sup> who have committed tawallī with the mushrukūn against the Muslims, and about those apparent Muslims whom Quraysh brought with them to face the Muslim army at Badr?<sup>23</sup> And what did Allah say about the grave-worshippers? What did He describe them with, except kufr?!

<sup>18</sup> Due to describing the companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ as foolish

<sup>19</sup> Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr (1/182)

<sup>20</sup> Ibid.

<sup>21</sup> Mukhtaṣar Sīrat ar-Rasūl (p. 41)

<sup>22</sup> Qur'ān 4:88

<sup>23</sup> Qur'ān 4:97

## 11 What he said between 00:23:14 and 00:24:40

*But the Murji'ah said the exact opposite thing. So this group called the murji'ah they were categorized or the main them about the murji'ah in the early days is that īmān does not go up and it does not go down (...) and we can't judge the person's īmān based on their actions so long as what they say is a word of faith.*

### 11.4 His incorrect statement regarding what the murji'ah believed stemming from his prior misunderstanding about the belief of the khawārij

Both the murji'ah and the khawārij believed īmān is one and does not increase or decrease (although there is debate between groups among them whether it may increase), the difference being that the khawārij have additionally misunderstood – or claimed to have misunderstood - the status of actions which carry threats of punishment, so they have made them all major kufr unrestrictedly and completely negated the īmān of their doers.

### 11.5 Those who are commonly understood as the murji'ah did declare takfīr on evident kufr

The Murji'at al-Fuqahā' and their modern successors – the ashā'irah and māturīdīyyah - take actions on their apparent status just like the people of Sunnah, and do, therefore declare takfīr on actions of kufr and shirk, although their reasoning differs. Because they do not believe īmān is connected to actions, they take these actions as a manifestation of what is in one's heart in terms of īmān – so the one who prostrates to an idol, or declares his loyalty to the disbelievers, or rejects anything from the clear matters, is seen as mushrik kāfir, however he is not seen as a kāfir due to his actions – rather the action is a manifestation to what he is inwardly. So this individual is declared takfīr upon according to murji'at al-fuqahā' but not in the same way the saved sect would declare takfīr upon him, who see the individual as having nullified his īmān there and there.

'Abdul-Qāhir al-Baghdādī رحمه الله said: And [Bishr al-Mārīsī] used to say regarding īmān that it is belief in the heart and on the tongue, just like Ibn ar-Rāwandī said about kufr that it is denial and rejection, and they both claim that prostration to an idol is not kufr, however it is an evidence of kufr.<sup>24</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Al-Farq Baynal-Firaq (p. 180)

What Hijāb is describing is the ghulāt al-murji'ah or the jahmīyyah who marginalize kufr to juhūd and istihlāl [denial and deeming one's prohibited actions permissible] which ironically, in many respects, fits his gang as well as his enemies from other modernists and the Jāmīyyah.

In general, to marginalize the murji'ah to one definition is academically dishonest – as Hijāb the orientalist would put it, as they have been different groups with differing definitions of īmān and kufr. One, however, cannot expect somebody like Hijāb to actually make a decent effort at learning before he speaks.

## 12 What he said between 00:41:16 and 00:41:33

*But they are a cancer of the ummah because in a sense they- whenever you have the khawārij or those who follow their way [takfīris] you have killing-indiscriminate killing of men women and children of Muslims and non-Muslims.*

When has killing and bloodshed ever ceased, Hijāb? Well it will never cease due to jihād continuing until the Day of Resurrection, but that's besides the point. Hijāb is concerned for the well-being of his brothers from among the Jews, Christians, Atheists, his gay professors, Rawāfiḍ and others – not for the Muslims. Otherwise he would have at least been silent on the topic of mujāhidūn and not speak against them or even go as far as to fabricate lies against them, but that is the modus operandi of his gang – he does not only lie about the mujāhidūn but against all those he deems as enemies and acts deceptively like he did with the Jāmī gang and other Surūrīs who do not share his manhaj. Or do you think we've forgotten when you have brought Haqīqatjou on your podcast, hoping to bully him into compliance but when you saw that he's levels above you where intellect is concerned, you've given up on your futile quest and grown to envy that enemy of Allah, unable to conceal your jealousy and hatred for him from anyone whom Allah has blessed with good insight.

Back to the point. Hijāb claims wherever there's the Saved Sect there's killing of men, women and children of Muslims and who he refers to as non-Muslims. Can he, then, point out where there is this takfīrī cancer as he puts it, in Myanmar? In our lands occupied by the cross-worshippers of Russia and other places? Rather wherever there is apostates, zanādiqah such as Hijāb and crusaders there is indiscriminate killing of Muslims regardless of age or gender, and wherever there is the takfīrīs then this killing is reciprocated according to

the shari'ah of Allah – each offense is repaid equally. Have you forgotten about the massacres in Diyālā, the torture at Abū Ghraib, or chemical warfare campaign in Fallūjah to the point that the residents of that city must, to this day, move out and conceive elsewhere in order to have somewhat healthy offspring?

When you have self-confidently declared during your disgraceful appearance on the JP podcast, that there is no active crusade going on anywhere around the world, have you forgotten about the crusade declared by Bush and which was never declared finished, and which is supported by Christians worldwide, and of course the Jews? Have you forgotten that the mujāhidūn have done nothing except that the crusaders have initiated aggression, prompting our brothers to answer with a response, hoping it will be at least in part equal? Or is your research on current events and what takes place in the Muslim world as weak and pathetic as your research into the religion itself?

You are the ones who keep crying about the situation the ummah has found herself in, yet you only bring treason and bloodshed. Wherever your gang or the Ikhwānī spawn of Shayāṭīn have fooled Muslims, you have only brought destruction and call that maṣlahah. May Allah deal with you and your supporters.

### 13 What he said between 00:42:20 and 00:45:01

*Now I think we need to look at some of the extreme groups now in history to kind of see where these ideas are being spread. So al-Muwahhidūn, we say that Spain was a time where there was convivencia and you know- mutual peace in there between Muslims, Christians and Jews (...) whenever there were notable exceptions to that, that was because of this idea or these ideas of khawārijism or khārijism coming into the psyche of those Muslims at that time (...) same mentality same arguments (...) al-Muwahhidūn which means you know the ones who are monotheists, they're monotheists. And we're talking here, they ruled over al-Maghrib and Andalus for about 150 years and these guys were brutal, they were you know completely intolerant (...) they were shunned groups, they were aberrational groups they were not accepted what they were saying was reminiscent of the early days of extremist- khawārijism. And the same thing with the Murābiṭūn (...) these are the aberration, these have always been the aberration because their arguments are not the theological, normal arguments that the majority demographic ever believed in.*

### **13.4 What he said about khawārij and takfīris sowing discord between Muslims and their kāfir subjects**

This is yet another proof that Hijāb knows next-to-nothing about the khawārij. In an authentic ḥadīth, the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ informs us of the khawārij and mentions that they will leave the mushrikūn and fight the Muslims. From lessons which history has provided us, we know of numerous stories about khawārij protecting the disbelievers and mushrikūn, while killing Muslims – even killing a šahābī and cutting his pregnant wife's belly open. While preserving the right of a Christian, and killing one of their own men for taking a date. This characteristic of theirs is being distorted by Hijāb because, in reality, he and his gang fit this description perfectly. Protecting the mushrikūn, affording them rights even if there is no grounds – no treaty or covenant in place – to necessitate fulfilling such rights, while screaming and barking at other Muslims, out of envy and jealousy due to their own lack of adherence to Islām, and, of course, because they are in reality upon the millah of kufr.

### **14.2 A remark about his mention of al-Muwahhidūn**

He mentions a misguided jahmī sect who were anything but muwahhidūn, who invaded Andalus, slaughtered many Muslims and greatly oppressed their kāfir subjects. But we will focus on why he is using their Arabic name and does not "westernise" it like he does with groups such as the Jāmīyyah – he says Madkhalites instead of Madākhilah, and with other groups – jahmites instead of jahmīyyah, ash'arites instead of ash'arīyyah, et cetera.

The purpose he is avoiding using butchered names for certain groups is to keep them alienated from his audience – if their names sound foreign, they feel foreign. Hence why he's always referring to us as takfīris and not excommunicants, or as khawārij and not as khārijites.

### **14.3 His mention of al-Murābiṭūn**

Likewise with this dynasty, he uses their original, Arabic name, in order to alienate his audience from them. However, this group is free from what he has accused them of. The Murābiṭūn were a Maghribī group which was invited into Andalus by the ruling Umayyad dynasty to help defend it from the creeping crusader invasion. The Muslims answered the call of their brothers, suppressed the crusaders, and established Islām in the land, ruling with the shar' of Allah despite what this zindiq is attempting to serve you about them.

#### 14.4 The aberration with no arguments?

Another western term he likes to impose upon the Muslims, like when he called a recording of Albānī's lecture an aberration – despite him discussing a matter in fiqh in-depth which is necessary if you want to have real knowledge – but Ḥijāb does not know that because he does not care about the religion. Then, he has truly exposed himself, and showed everyone that he has never attended a real circle of learning.

Now we have to stop and mention one important matter, and that is the disorganised behaviour of Mohammed Ḥijāb, particularly on social media. One sees him ask people whether he can "suck on your wife's tits to make her mahram" and suggest that individuals give one another "golden showers" and "slap one another's face" for sexual gratification. Following that, once he realizes his error, he does not face up to it. Instead, he records a video, explaining how there is "a method behind the madness" and how he is actually working on "an elaborate masterplan" which us, regular viewers, are just too stupid to comprehend. Well it seems that Ḥijāb is the only intelligent individual in this world, since nobody else appears to behave in the same manner. Question to Ḥijāb: Is deleting these videos you've made, also part of your genius masterplan?

It appears that whatever does not comfort with the majority of Muslims – which Ḥijāb has a nasty habit of distorting and calling it a consensus – is an aberration, which should be shunned and not paid any attention to. We will skip over his idiotic bid'ah of turning the majority opinion into the consensus, and instead ask him where is his evidence that majority opinion is always correct and obligatory to follow? Because last time we have checked, the ummah will split into seventy-three sects. Besides that, the majority is always dispraised in the Qur'ān.<sup>25</sup> So where is your evidence?

You have none, aside from your distortions and desires.

#### 14 What he said between 00:49:17 and 00:52:13

*And of course we have ISIS (...) and in many ways this is probably one of the most- in top there most vicious and intolerant groups Islām has ever seen. I mean I will never forget myself I will never forget some time ago, maybe it was about um, sorry it was about maybe two or three years ago four years ago I*

---

<sup>25</sup> Qur'ān 3:110, 10:92, et cetera

*can't remember what, I want to to be honest yeah, five years ago whenever it was yeah when they were fighting.against Bashār al-Assad and so on, and this guy called al-Jawlānī, who was the leader of Jabhat an-Nuṣrah at that time. And Jabhat an-Nuṣrah was another group which is connected to al-Qā'idah okay. So imagine and their leader's Ayman adh-Dhawāhīrī. The Egyptian doctor he was the leader. And Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī who was the leader of ISIS, he wasn't on the scene at those times and al-Jawlānī he was being interviewed in al-Jazeera you can find this interview if you like. I'll never forget this, he was asked he said they are- the ISIS what they're doing is they're taking our women and children as slaves and I thought this is unbelievable like can you imagine you are like literally friends with- you're fighting you're eating with you're praying with you're playing with your kids are playing with their kids, whatever it is you are one group, and all of us are you, you are one group. This shows you the implosive nature of takfirism that you end up fighting your own friend your own takfīrī friend that like he's like you in your inclination but you end up fighting him- in fact he's your first target, he's your first target. You're right next to Israel you're not far away from them but instead- imagine what this does to you right, instead of thinking we need to go and fight uh, I don't know the Israeli occupier or these or the Zionists, no we have to fight my friend that I was eating with fish and chips or whatever is he- or the tāhīnah and kofta, shawarma that you were eating with him and take his wife instead of taking as a wife or this and that he'll take her as a slave. Imagine having this wife at your house as a slave she was a guest- can you imagine this she was- you might have been a guest two weeks ago, now she's a slave? (...) like this is crazy stuff man, what arguments must you be making in order to convince us of this? Who on earth would be convinced with this?*

This will not be elaborated upon in detail and the reader will soon realize why. So Ḥijāb is mentioning narrating a story from his own life and yet does not even know when this occurred? What a great "ustādh" coming in unprepared. We truly feel sorry for those who consider themselves students of this imbecile.

Then he states that Shaykh Abū Bakr al-Baghdādī تقبله الله was not on the scene "at the time" and this is another point at which he exposed his absolute inability to make proper research into events surrounding the Muslims, and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ disassociated himself from those who wake up not having any concern for the wider Muslim nation. Further, he narrates something from an interview between a channel loved by ṭawāghīt, and Abū Muḥammad

al-Jawlānī the ṣāḥwājī apostate who committed tawallī with the democrats against Muslims, then with the Turks, now he's trying with the wider Western sphere, and in addition to that, doesn't rule with Islām despite having tamkīn in whatever is left of his territories – he kept on losing piece after piece of his land after the ṣāḥawāt of Shām betrayed the truthful ones. Actually it's unclear why Ḥijāb doesn't like al-Jawlānī – it seems to us like they would understand one another perfectly. But maybe it's just his Surūrī taqīyyah. Now what he mentioned of the interview is a pure lie upon the Islāmic State, as the policy of the Islāmic State towards the women and children of apostate factions in the resistance is that they are Muslim and compelled to stay with their husbands. Further, if they deemed those women as apostates as well, then they would definitely not take them as slaves. They do not permit taking slaves from apostate women – they treat them just like the male apostates. Since Mohammed Ḥijāb is so keen on narrating this lie, tell us – where are those Muslim women who have been enslaved by the Islāmic State? Have you taken them into some shelter, that none of them is speaking to the media? Or have your friends the crusaders bombed them in their many campaigns against women and children, or perhaps dropped white phosphorus on them in Moṣul? You either need to bring evidence for this lie, or publicly repent, apologize to the mujāhidūn and shut up.

"Like this is crazy stuff man, what arguments must you be making in order to convince us of this? Who on earth would be convinced with this?" No one, because it's a lie with not even a shred of truth in it.

## 15 What he said between 00:53:30 and 00:56:49

*There's a woman who tortured a cat and the prophet said I saw a woman in the hellfire because she tortured a cat. Like how did she torture it? The cat was hungry and whatever and she just left her to die it- slow and painful and tormenting death (...) if you ask one of those takfīrīs just like if you would have asked the khawārij (...) you ask the ISIS supporter what is the hukm of killing a cat or torturing a cat? What do you think he'll say well look ḥarām man look he's torturing a cat astaghfirullah the prophet said there- it's okay you can't torture a cat no you can't kill a cat but you can torture a human being and kill a human being? Now in what world does that make sense. Now this guy Abū Qatādah the one with a huge beard [laughter] have you seen him? (...) the guy was making fatwa saying you can burn the kids in Algeria and the women and children in Algeria and this is- and he's getting refuted and- (...) this is the*

*things that they are actually saying (...) they're making fatwas that you can take a child and kill a child and kill her- we've seen these fatwas (...) when we were younger we used to watch Anwar al-'Awlaqī and his stuff was really good in terms of the way he spoke and stuff and all of a sudden he came on YouTube on my feed with with a gun [laughter] and by the way you will never see this video on YouTube- this video has been removed (...) saying something like you'll never be safe in your airports again I was thinking what the hell just happened here man? Is it the case now psychologically that they put him in prison and he was- maybe, is it the case because he was part of the 'Awlaqīyyah tribe which was connected to al-Qā'idah? That's possible as well by the way because he's from Yemen don't forget and he's part of a tribe which a lot of them are connected to al-Qā'idah. Is it the case that he actually agreed with these arguments- all of these are possible factors and truths that could be the case (...) this ideology is unsustainable and impractical and impossible and anti-Islām, no matter who we think is sincere and promulgated it. Because it involves killing of women, children, young people, Muslims and non-Muslims et cetera.*

### **16.1 His claim that mujāhidūn torture people**

Bring your evidence if you're truthful. Testimonies from anonymous individuals do not count.

### **16.2 Laughing at a long beard**

And all Muslims are in agreement that ridiculing any aspect of Islām is apostasy.<sup>26</sup>

### **16.3 We do not claim Abū Qatādah**

You've mentioned that this man has been refuted by others – which is true, and this is the correct way of the Muslims, that they correct one another. The only one who dislikes to be corrected is you, while you're attempting to "correct" others and impose yourself on them. Abū Qatādah is not claimed by any of us, and he's been discredited a long time ago along with the other Jordanian agent Abū Muḥammad al-Maqdisī, they have both been refuted by our scholars and students of knowledge, and the fact that you connect them and Dhawāhirī to us is just another testament to the fact that you're clueless of the affairs of Muslims.

---

<sup>26</sup> Qur'an 9:65

## 16.4 His assumptions about the motivations of mujāhidūn and truthful scholars

Now just because you cannot do anything in the name of Islām without receiving any worldly benefit does not mean that's the case for everyone else. And we do not have any worldly motivations, as has been explained when you tried to claim that we declare takfīr for worldly gain. You ridicule the mujāhid scholars who terrify the enemies because you possess neither knowledge nor the physical ability to join the caravan. Everything about you is surface-level, your sub-par level of religious knowledge, your secular education which is more of an embarrassment than anything else, your GMO Cow looking body, which you seem to like to show around. Not sure if you're looking for a second wife or maybe a boyfriend, but it's embarrassing for everyone involved. Including those that have to watch it on their screens for whatever reason.

## 16.5 His lie on the mujāhidūn that killing women and children is the basis of their motivations

The mujāhidūn do not deliberately kill women and children ever, and this is the *asl* according to the Muslims. This only happens either as an error, which you and your gang like to always use to attack the truthful ones and doubt their intentions, or in a retaliatory for the enemy killing our women and children – which is permitted in the sharī'ah, but you might have an issue wrapping it over your head as it's way above your level. The third scenario is *tatarrus*, which is well-known in the books of fiqh, but you might – again – not be educated enough to understand this. Or, you might deliberately try to hide it, like you often do with issues which aren't very popular among the kāfir population.

While some of the issues which are at play here are subject to disagreement among the scholars, does not mean we should discard them altogether – then Hijāb would have to discard his whole career. The mujtahid who gets his judgement right gets two rewards, while the one who errs gets one reward. The problem here, however, is that the opponents of the truthful, noble knights of this ummah do not argue on this basis – they only argue based on their own desires and the desires of their slavemasters. So, whenever the kāfir dislikes something, it becomes evil according to Islām. And whatever the kāfir is pleased and happy with, is the religious canon. This means no hijrah, not jihād, no sharī'ah, no khilāfah. Ironically all of these are points of disagreement between the takfīris and the deviants, present company included.

## 17. What he said between 00:57:08 and 01:00:08

*I'll read something Ibn Taymiyyah he himself mentioned. Ibn Taymiyyah said the following (...) so we have to establish difference between someone committing kufr and someone becoming a kāfir. Sometimes you can commit kufr and not become a kāfir why? Because there's 'udhr bil-jahl which is the excuse of ignorance, (...) and it can be khata' someone can be making a mistake, and ikrāh which is an idea of someone compelling someone else and his heart is full of īmān (...) Ta'wīl or the idea of interpreting something in a certain way and by the way in ta'wīl with this issue, if you think about it, ta'wīl of 'ālim if he thinks he's right and he's wrong, this is actually jahl (...) even more ignorant than the basic 'āmī [layperson] who doesn't know the answer in the first place. Taqlīd he might be following someone who he thinks is representing Islām on an issue.*

Now, after a whole hour, is Hijāb getting to the actual topic of his lecture. Well he has only named this lecture what he named it, in order to attract attention anyway. What he quotes is what the so-called takfīris abide by and what their scholars teach them. However, he is only relaying this quote in order to bring up his own, faulty explanation. So he mentions this issue of committing kufr and not becoming a kāfir. This is correct in principle, and even in his wording you might be getting the idea that he's explaining it correctly, and you would be right. However, if you follow Hijāb's work closely, you will see that he will try to excuse kufr absolutely, and even excuse major shirk, and obscure major shirk after knowing the reality – that is, after all, how this democrat still considers himself within the fold of Islām. Then he mentions the excuse of ignorance, and of course he hardly elaborates. Doesn't mention that this doesn't apply to *aṣl ad-dīn* – in fact he doesn't mention this important concept anywhere in this lecture, probably because he knows his followers would have no choice but to declare takfīr upon him once learning about his reality. Then, he explains making a mistake and being compelled, however what he doesn't mention again, is that the compelled individual is not a mukallaf – none of his actions count while he's being compelled, as long as these actions he does, do not go beyond the scope of compulsion. So for example, a Muslim is being held at gunpoint and commanded to prostrate to an idol. He can prostrate to this idol while being full of īmān, however if he decides to curse the prophet ﷺ because he thinks it will help him, or any other reason – he wasn't compelled to do this, and thus he becomes an apostate by that. And this is important to explain to the Muslims, as

many might become disbelievers under this false impression that *ikrāh* is unrestricted. Okay, last point that will be addressed is that he called the mistaken mujtahid a *jāhil* and a worse one than the general lay-Muslim. Whatever his motivation for this claim is, it's not correct and will never be correct. On the other hand, no matter how much knowledge Mohammed Ḥijāb has, if he does *ijtihād* on an issue and gets it right, he is still more ignorant than the most ignorant of the Muslims, and that is because he's a *zindīq kāfir*, and a *kāfir* or *mushrik* is always a *jāhil* even if his knowledge is abundant. And the lay-Muslim is always '*ālim* even if his knowledge is little, because he fears Allah. The evidences for this are many from the *āthār* of the salaf, particularly from the students of Ibn Mas'ūd and Ibn 'Abbās – however, for the sake of brevity, the following should suffice.

Ibn Abī Lahī'ah<sup>27</sup> reported from Ibn Abī 'Amarah, from 'Ikrimah, from Ibn 'Abbās, who said: Knowledge about the Most Merciful, that nothing be associated with Him, that they permit whatever He permitted, and prohibit whatever He prohibited. He fulfills His Will, and is certain that he will meet Him.<sup>28</sup>

From Ibn Mas'ūd رضي الله عنه that he said: Knowledge is not the abundance of information, but knowledge is from the abundance of *khashīyah*.<sup>29</sup>

### 18. What he said between 01:00:45 and 01:06:30

*Actually there's one more thing I was going to mention which I will mention before we end it's a good thing, yeah, with Ḥāfiẓ ibn Abī Bala'ah yeah, I want to deal with one particular actual argument that ISIS put forward and I saw this just recently in the speaker's corner video and that's a very weird thing to mention here- one of the brothers in the park, Madkhalite being refuted by a Takfirite and the Takfirite made takfir of him- well you know, no surprises there right, have you seen the video? He said you're a *kāfir* he said why- because he said you're a disbeliever I said why is it because he gave some reasons for it which were pathetic and ridiculous but an argument that is usually made by them is they say that if you work with- and this is how ISIS make their argument and al-Qā'idah make this argument as well, but al-Qā'idah are less severe in doing *ta'mīm* [generalization] or it's called *takfīr at-tasalsulī* - chain takfir. ISIS*

<sup>27</sup> Weak

<sup>28</sup> Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr (6/544)

<sup>29</sup> Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr (6/545)

are just on steroids with this stuff. You know they- literally they will just keep chaining takfir like anyone who was implicated he's involved in that as well. And they will say the issue of at-tajassus or the idea of being a jāsūs or spy is kufr akbar mukhrij min al-millah. It's a major type of- that takes the person outside of the fold of Islām. Okay, no problem- why? Because you're conspiring with the enemy (...) and they'll bring the āyāt of tawallī in the Qur'ān like if you ally then you will become like them. But Ḥāṭib ibn Abī Balta'ah who's a ṣahābī, he actually- I'm not sure if you know the story it's in the sīrah and it's ṣahīh. The story of Ḥāṭib is that the prophet was going to conquer Makkah and he only told a few people and said don't tell anyone. Then Ḥāṭib being one of the friends of the prophet went and told his family about it. He was a spy for the Qurashīs in a sense- for the pagans, polytheists (...) so this is clearly spying right, now the prophet when he found out he forgave him and he mentioned the fact that he's from the people of Badr and that Allah has forgiven the people of Badr (...) they say the reason- takfirīs when you bring them this example because the question we would ask is how can you forgive him if- how can you forgive him on a matter like this? Why wasn't he killed why was- if he was a traitor- how could you forgive him on a matter like this- and they'll say it is because it was khāṣun bihī it was specified to him because he was from the fighters of Badr but this- but Allah says (...) if you commit shirk he will completely cut off your deeds, so kufr and īmān is not person-specific it can never be person-specific, whoever commits shirk and kufr- polytheism and disbelief even if it's the prophet, then that person will be treated as a disbeliever. So because it's our 'aqīdah issue, it cannot be khāṣ wa 'ām. It cannot be because that's an issue of fiqh- it has to be generic right, so the point is, if they say- if they use this demented logic which they use in order to create, to create an argument for suicide bombing and then- bombing in the houses and I don't what other places or concerts or whatever it is, they say even the Muslims they're to blame- or they'll do in Muslim countries how many shabāb how many times they do it in Somalia, how many? So many times isn't it- what's their logic, these guys are you know traitors and all this kind of thing so, they need to realize that if it was the case that it was treachery and it was kufr then how can explain Ḥāṭib ibn Abī Balta'ah's case? (...) so it must be the case- it's kufr dūn kufr, which means it's is it's not actually kufr akbar, it must be the case it's some kind of kufr asghar or it's not kufr that will take you out of Islām (...) which is why all the majority of Muslim institutions and centers of Islāmic power, no one's convinced with these pathetic arguments. And when some people from the non-

*Muslim community ask who condemns this, the question really is who doesn't condemn this.*

### **18.1 Hijāb's atrocious behaviour towards Muslims**

A few weeks before this lecture was released, Hijāb ambushed one of the truthful Muslims حفظه الله in Speaker's Corner, shoving camera's in his face, and demanding to have a debate, despite the Muslim telling him, he has neither the time nor the appetite to speak to him. Hijāb, however, kept attempting to bully the brother, so he had no choice but to concede. Now what Hijāb did, is attempt to permit fabricating laws to rival Allah as a tāghūt, in order to gain what he thinks is maṣlahah, but is actually hellfire. He has used a few pathetic shubuhāt to justify his falsehood, but every single upload of this video was swarmed by hordes of muwahhidūn who clarified his ḥalālah and made the issue clear to any Muslim who was swayed by Hijāb's arguments. Now, the same Muslim he and his gang have been abusing like this for years – for nothing but speaking the truth – is the same one who made takfir upon the Jāmī, for reasons which Hijāb does not mention and calls them pathetic. The reason why he does not mention them and calls them pathetic, is because he does not want to admit that the muwahhid is on the truth. So the reasons why this Jāmī character was declared a kāfir, one of the reasons is because he took part in ridiculing the prophet which is kufr by consensus, and ironically, Hijāb and his gang declared takfir upon the Jāmī for this reason as well. Hence why Hijāb does not mention it, and discourages his audience from searching this particular issue up. Another reason is permitting spying on Muslims for the disbelievers, which will be dealt with shortly, if Allah wills.

### **18.2 He alleges that the Islāmic State declare chain takfir ad-infinitum**

And Hijāb has been attempting to take chain takfir [and really and truly, all takfir] out of the religion for a long time now.<sup>30</sup> What he claims now, is that the mujāhidūn of the Islāmic State declare chain takfir ad-infinitum, including anyone who is implicated [We don't know what exactly he means by this, but we assume that he means somebody who is not completely sure of the kufr of the previous link in the chain]. Now this is not the policy of the Islāmic State and never has been. Anytime ghulāt al-mukaffirah have been discovered to be in the ranks, they have been debated, and if they insisted on their bid'ah, they were asked to leave the organisation, and this has been stated by the leaders of

---

<sup>30</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ytlpqyk4bIE>

the Islāmic State on many occasions. The scholars of the Islāmic State – in particular Turkī al-Bin'ālī – have been vocal against this bid'ah of including takfīr in aṣl ad-dīn and declaring infinite chain takfīr based on it, for a long time, authoring many works in this area, debating many of these ghulāt, and dismantling every single of their arguments – which weren't really arguments. Just like with Ḥijāb, what they have introduced in the religion is grounded in desires and not in knowledge. This concern for protecting 'aqīdah and manhaj from any innovations in the Islāmic State, has come to the level where the official scholarly committee of the State threatened to break off and rebel against the authority, based on a faulty fatwa passed by Shaykh Ibrāhīm al-Badrī. Of course Ḥijāb does not know any of this, in fact he knows nothing about the Islāmic State – all his information is whatever lies he has made up in his head, which he is now unwilling to let go of. It is recommended that the reader reads 'Clarifying Matters Of Methodology'<sup>31</sup> which is a rendition of a series of lectures delivered by the scholarly committee, to clarify the correct manhaj in takfīr, and to protect the Muslims from misguidance.

Shaykh 'Alī al-Khuḍayr said regarding those who refrain from declaring takfīr upon clear kufr: It is whoever falls into kufr which the scholars have unanimously agreed upon takfīr due to it from those who say 'la ilaha illallah'. There is an elaboration here: If he knows that one fell into this kufr and he refrains from takfīr of him after this knowledge, then he is a kāfir. Ibn Taymīyah in Aṣ-Ṣārim al-Maslūl cited a consensus [over this point] and said: "Whoever does not declare takfīr of one who believes in the divinity of 'Alī has disbelieved; there is no doubt in the kufr of one who refrains in declaring his kufr." What also proves this is the hadith of Mālik al-Ashja'i: "Whoever says la ilaha illallah and disbelieves in what is worshipped besides Allah, his blood and wealth is protected..." The significance of this is that it is proof that the wealth and blood of an individual is not protected until he disbelieves in what is worshipped besides Allah, and from kufr in it is takfīr of its people.<sup>32</sup>

Further about those who refrain upon unclear kufr legitimately and those who choose to refuse to acknowledge kufr after having been shown its reality: It is where a disagreement has occurred regarding the general laymen of the innovated groups such as the Jahmīyyah. So for example, if one was to have knowledge about them and the evidences proving their kufr and that it is

<sup>31</sup> <https://peopleoftawhid.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Clarifying-Matters-of-Methodology.pdf>

<sup>32</sup> Meaning takfīr upon its people is from the inferred requirements of the testimony of faith known by revelation

obligatory to declare their kufr, this nullifier applies to him if he was to refrain from declaring takfir of them. But the one who views that they do not disbelieve due to a barrier he sees preventing their takfir, such as them being laymen or that they have interpretation or that they were misled and confused or because of ignorance, then it is not permissible to declare takfir of those who refrained, and this nullifier does not apply to them.<sup>33</sup>

### **18.3 Tawallī is a major kufr in every case and Hijāb's distortions will never change that fact**

Mohammed Hijāb the Jew is – just like with his hopping around the hukm of apostasy<sup>34</sup> – again attempting to fool the Muslims with his distortions. May Allah turn him into a pig and the rest of his gang into monkeys just like the slaves of ṭawāghīt who did the same thing with the aḥkām of sabat in the time of Dāwūd عليه السلام.

Not only does this hypocrite idiot accuse the pure muwahhidūn of ascribing major kufr to the witnesses of Badr رضي الله عنهم, he's also lying upon our explanation of the story of Hāṭib. None of us said what Hāṭib did was tawallī for you to accuse us of making a Hāṭib-specific excuse. You do not understand the matter at hand and then look for faulty interpretations to ascribe your enemies – your enemies who have crystal clarity on what occurred with Hāṭib as it's one of the major points of discussion among us.

Shaykh Nāṣir al-Fahd فك الله أسره refutes Hijāb and his falsehood: The people of falsehood use the story of Hāṭib's (radiyallahu 'anhu) writing to the kuffar of the Quraysh and notifying them of the news of the Prophet (sallallahu 'alayhi was sallam) as proof that supporting (mudhāharah) the kuffar is not kufr. The story is in the sahihayn and others on the authority of 'Ali (radiyallahu 'anhu) about the Opening of Makkah, he said:

"The Messenger of Allāh (sallallahu 'alayhi was sallam) sent me, az-Zubayr, and al-Miqdad somewhere saying: 'Go forth until you reach Rawdah Khakh. There you will find a lady with a letter. Take the letter from her.' So we set out and our horses ran at full pace till we got at Rawdah where we found the lady and said (to her): 'Take out the letter.' She replied: 'I have no letter with me.' We said: 'You will most certainly take out the letter or else we will take off your clothes.' She took it out of her braid, and we took the letter and brought it

---

<sup>33</sup> <https://peopleoftawhid.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Notes-on-the-Elucidation-of-the-Nullifiers-of-Islam.pdf>

<sup>34</sup> <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=O9xMR-TbQAO>

to the Messenger of Allah. It contained a statement from Ḥāṭib ibn Abi Balta’ah to some of the mushrikun of Makkah informing them of some of the intentions of the Messenger of Allah. Then the Messenger of Allah said: ‘O Ḥāṭib! What is this?’ Ḥāṭib replied: ‘Do not hasten to give your judgment about me. I was a man closely connected with the Quraysh, but I did not belong to them, while the other muhajirūn with you had their relatives who would protect their dependents in Makkah. I wanted by my lack of blood relation to them, to take among them a favor by which to protect my dependents. I did this neither because of kufr or apostasy nor out of pleasure with kufr over Islām.’ The Messenger of Allah said: ‘Ḥāṭib has told you the truth.’ ‘Umar said: ‘O Messenger of Allah, allow me to strike the neck of this munāfiq!’ The Messenger of Allah said: ‘Verily he witnessed the Battle of Badr, and what would make you come to know, perhaps Allah has already looked at the People of Badr and said: ‘Do whatever you like, for I have forgiven you.’”

Thus [they say] Ḥāṭib assisted the kuffar of Makkah and along with that, the Prophet (sallallahu ‘alayhi was sallam) did not declare him a disbeliever; so this proves that mudhāharah and helping the kuffār is not kufr!!!

### **The Response to this Misconception:**

No person of falsehood uses an evidence from the Book and the Sunnah in order to prove his falsehood except that within that proof itself there contains what contradicts his falsehood and makes clear its corruption, as was mentioned by Shaykh al-Islām رحمه الله. I shall mention what indicates the opposite of what they sought after from this proof, from the proof itself, and that will become clear from various angles.

### **The First Angle**

Verily, this proof is from the clearest of proofs concerning the kufr of the one who performs mudhāharah and his apostasy from the Dīn of Islām. This is shown clearly from three things in the hadīth:

**The First:** The statement of ‘Umar in this hadith: “Allow me to strike the neck of this munāfiq.” And in another narration (it is reported that he said): “Certainly he has disbelieved.” And in another narration, after the Messenger ﷺ said: “Did he not witness Badr?” ‘Umar replied, “Yes, however he has gone back and helped your enemies against you.” This proves that what was well established with ‘Umar and the Companions was that mudhāharah of the kuffar and assisting them is kufr and apostasy from Islām. He did not say these words except due to what he saw of what apparently was kufr.

**The Second:** The tacit approval of the Messenger ﷺ for what ‘Umar understood as he did not censure him for his takfir of Hātib; rather, he only mentioned the excuse of Hātib.

**The Third:** Hātib رضي الله عنه said: “I did this neither because of kufr or apostasy nor out of pleasure with kufr over Islām.” This proves that it was also established with him that mudhāharah of the kuffar is kufr, apostasy, and being pleased with kufr. He only mentioned the reality of his action.

### **The Second Angle**

Hātib رضي الله عنه assisted the Messenger ﷺ against his enemies, helped him with his self, wealth, tongue, and opinion in all of his battles, witnessed Badr and Hudaybīyyah with him, and their people are clearly in the Jannah (promised Jannah). He also assisted the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi was sallam) in this battle (the Opening of Makkah), for he went out in it with the Muslims as a warrior with his life and wealth to wage war against the mushrikūn, and he never gave victory to the kuffar against the Muslims – not by body, not by wealth, not by tongue, and not by opinion. He possesses of previous good acts what every one who reads knows. And with all of this, when he wrote to the mushrikun, informing them of the departure of the Prophet ﷺ that was not mudhāharah from him towards them or giving victory because he was going to fight them himself with the Prophet ﷺ; he was already certain of victory and assistance, ‘Umar accused him of nifaq and the Messenger ﷺ asked about that, after which he negated kufr and apostasy from himself and [then parts] of the Quran were revealed concerning him that would be recited until the Day of Judgment. They are the words of the Most High:

Oh you who believe do not take My enemy and your enemy as allies, extending to them affection while they have disbelieved in what came to you of the truth, having driven out the Prophet and yourselves [only] because you believe in Allah, your Lord. If you have come out for jihad in My cause and seeking means to My approval [take them not as friends]. You confide to them affection, but I am most knowing of what you have concealed and what you have declared. And whoever does it among you has certainly strayed from the straight way.

This is from the most tremendous of evidences that the one who helps the kuffar with his life, wealth, tongue, or opinion and its likes has apostated from the Din of Islām and Allah’s refuge is sought.

### **The Third Angle**

The letter of Ḥāṭib to the kuffār of Makkah was not from mudhāharah and assisting them against the Muslims at all, for it has been narrated by some of the people (scholars) of battles, as it is in Al-Fath, that the wording of the letter was: As for what follows. O assembly of Quraysh. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ is approaching you with an army like the night that marches like the torrent. By Allah! if he was to come to you all alone, Allah would most certainly give him victory and fulfill for him His promise, so look after yourselves, was-salām.”

There is nothing in this what might be understood to be mudhāharah and giving victory to them. Rather, he disobeyed the Messenger (sallallahu ‘alayhi was sallam) by writing it to them. It was a major sin that was expiated by his previous works.

### **The Fourth Angle**

The action of Ḥāṭib has been differed over, is it kufr or not? If it is said that it is kufr, then this is a proof that benefiting the kuffār with the like of this light matter is kufr so it is therefore a notice that what is beyond it such as giving victory with life, wealth or any other than that is kufr more so. If it is said that it is not kufr, then this is only the case because the reality of his action was not helping the kuffār or assisting them against the Muslims. Although, having said that, it is a means to kufr and a path towards it even though it lacks the picture of giving victory to the kuffār due to what has proceeded in the first angle; therefore, this example is not to be used as evidence against this issue of ours nor does it weaken that basis.

### **The Fifth Angle**

Ḥāṭib only did that out of a [faulty] interpretation (ta'wīl) thinking that his letter would not harm the Muslims and that Allah would give victory to His dīn and prophet – even if the mushrikūn knew of their departure towards them. There has appeared in some of the wordings of the hadith that Ḥāṭib, excusing himself, stated: “I knew that Allah would assist His messenger and complete for him his affair.” Al-Bukhari رحمه الله narrated the story of Ḥāṭib in the section, “Seeking the Repentance of the Apostates and Rebellious Ones and Fighting them.” As well as in the section, “What Has Been Narrated About Those Who Make [Faulty] Interpretations.” Al-Hafidh said in Al-Fath: “The excuse of Ḥāṭib is what he himself mentioned, for he did that out of a [faulty] interpretation thinking that there is no harm in it.”

Hence, there is a great difference between what he did whilst being certain that the kuffār would not benefit from his letter in their war with the Messenger ﷺ

الله عليه وسلم and the one who gave them victory and assisted them with what they would benefit from in their war against Islām and its people.

### The Sixth Angle

It is to be said to the one who uses this hadīth to prove the absence of kufr for the one who performs mudhāharah: does this hadith prove that every type of mudhāharah towards the kuffār and help towards them (against the Muslims) is not kufr and apostasy? If he answers, “Yes,” then he has violated and gone against the ijmā’ and has no precedent in that; so there is nothing to be said to him. If, however, he answers: “No,” then it is to be said: “So what are the examples in which the one who assists the kuffār has disbelieved?” So this hadith of Ḥāṭib will counter whatever example he mentions and what answer will he have for this countering? This is our response.<sup>35</sup>

وصلى الله وسلم على محمد

---

<sup>35</sup> <https://peopleoftawhid.org/removing-a-misconception-propagated-by-the-people-of-falsehood-regarding-the-story-of-hatib/>

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: A tā'ifah from my nation will not cease to fight upon the truth, triumphant until the day of judgement...